| | | Programmatic Impact | Fiscal Impact on Specialty Mental Health Medi-Cal | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | | Federal | State | MHP |
| 1. | Move from traditional therapies such as play therapy to services that have been proven be more effective practices | Would require training for staff to gain expertise in providing new types of services. Could produce better outcomes since these practices have demonstrated effectiveness Evidence based practices are not available for all populations or diagnoses. They also change over time as new information becomes available. | Could have a long term reduction in FFP by providing more effective services | Would require significant investment in staff training Could have a long term SGF savings by reducing cost per case by providing more effective services | Would require additional funds for staff training and for retooling existing or implementing new programs |
| 2. | Make AB 3632 youth eligible for Medi-Cal | 1. This would require a Home and Community Based waiver to expand Medi-Cal eligibility. Youth would have to qualify for an institutional level (defined as a hospital, nursing facility or intermediate care facility for persons with mental retardation) of care in order to be eligible. It could expand the range of services that would be eligible for | Waiver has to be cost neutral—that is, the total amount of FFP can be no more than would exist without the waiver. All health care costs, not just mental health care would have to be included in the waiver and would come under the requirement for cost neutrality The costs for the population being added would previously not have been in the base. | Could increase SGF under EPSDT Could decrease state mandate funding Additional state staffing needed to analyze, develop and implement waiver. | Could increase MHP share of EPSDT growth Could reduce county social service costs for out-of-home care for some of these children/youth. |

| 3. Change EPSDT eligibility to clarify the word "ameliorate" | reimbursement, as long as the services were necessary to avoid institutionalization 1. Analysis awaiting more information regarding proposed change. | Analysis pending | Analysis pending | Analysis pending |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| 4. Capitate EPSDT | Would create incentives to limit both access and services Would increase program flexibility by eliminating claiming by service, SMAs, settling to cost report, etc. Revenues would be easier to project, and there would be greatly reduced risk of audit disallowances. Would be difficult for small MHPs to continue to exist without some kind of risk pools, risk corridors and/or reinsurance Would require major programmatic and fiscal restructuring. MHPs would need to become more sophisticated in managing access and cost per client | FFP would be dependent on number and type of beneficiaries rather than services provided | SGF expenditures would be dependent on number and type of beneficiaries rather than services provided. Additional state staff needed to develop, implement and monitor capitation. | MHP share of growth would be dependent on number and type of beneficiaries rather than services provided |

| | since funds would be capped. Both MHP and DMH billing and claiming systems would need to be changed. MHPs would need to report encounter and cost data for waiver purposes, but would not settle to cost under the current cost reporting system. | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| 5. Establish Medi- Cal eligibility for youth in the juvenile justice system who are awaiting adjudication | Would enable programs already providing services to these youth to get FFP to maintain or expand services Could encourage MHPs to develop new services for this population | Would increase FFP This might require a waiver which would carry cost effectiveness requirements Clarifications of existing requirements may expand federal funding | Could increase SGF if new services are implemented for this population | Could increase MHP share of match for EPSDT growth if new services are implemented for this population |

| 6. | Provide for/clarify the ability to provide adult peer support services under the Rehab Option and Targeted Case Management or add these services to State Medi-Cal Plan Services might include self- help support groups, drop-in centers, client-run crises/respite services, clubhouses, talaphone support | recovery-oriented services. | Increase FFP for short term More cost effective services could reduce FFP over the long term | Could require additional state staffing resources to implement | Expanded services would require additional local match More cost effective services could reduce local costs over the long term |
|----|--|---|---|---|--|
| | clubhouses, telephone support lines, etc. for clients at high risk of rehospitalization | | | | |
| 7. | Add employment services to State Medi-Cal Plan such as vocational assessments, work preparation activities, development of job | Support existing employment services Redirect other existing services to employment focused services Expand employment services | Increase FFP for short term More cost effective services could reduce FFP over the long term | Would require additional state staffing resources to implement | Expanded services would require additional local match More cost effective services could reduce local costs |

| | | | | 1 | • | , |
|----|---|----|---|--|---|--|
| | and career development plans, assistance in locating employment and/or integrated supported employment such as outreach/job coaching, on-the- | | | | | over the long term |
| 8. | job support, etc. Include coverage for services to adults with substance abuse and mental illness; create the ability to provide integrated treatment to those at highest risk for rehospitalization. | | Allow dually diagnosed individuals to receive integrated treatment for both disorders Encourage expansion of dually diagnosed services/programs | Increase FFP for short term More cost effective services could reduce FFP over long term | Would require additional state staffing resources to implement | Expanded services would require additional local match. More cost effective services could reduce local costs esp for repeat hospitalization over long term |
| 9. | Replace day treatment intensive and day rehabilitation for adults with partial hospitalization. | 1. | Focus adult day services on short-term intensive services using a more standardized partial hospitalization model. Simplify administrative work involved with monitoring and claiming | Assumption is limited impact on FFP, because resources/services would be redirected to other more effective service delivery models. | Would require additional state staffing resources to implement | Same as for FFP |

| | FFP. 2. Would involve prochanges in some lorder to continue FFP | MHPs in | | |
|--|---|--|-----------|---|
| 10. Waive IMD exclusion for freestanding psychiatric hospitals and psychiatric health facilities greater than 16 beds serving adults for inpatient services. | Could increase nuacute inpatient be some MHPs Could result in he closer to home for MHPs This could create incentives (by vir availability) for nuavailability) for nuavailability for | services if hospitalization increased. services if hospitalization increased. services if hospitalization increased. | No impact | MHP savings due to the fact that FFP would cover half of what is now a total local cost Could result in lower rates due to increased competition |
| 11. Align MH Medi- Cal with the private sector for | 4. Would reduce abi provide some psy and case manager | rch rehab | | Could increase MHP costs for non Medi-Cal eligible |

| proposed "Tier 2" and "Tier 3" Medi- Cal beneficiaries (those in optional aid codes—does not include those on SSI or TANF) | services for Tier 2 beneficiaries (i.e., residential treatment and day treatment). In some cases there could also be limits on the number of days for some service categories such as inpatient | | | services. Could result in increased cost for inpatient services if if community-based services of greater intensity than those provided in the public sector are needed to keep clients stable. |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| 12. Share of cost for pharmacy for adults | Would make it more difficult for some clients to get medication | No impact on MH FFP unless clients needed more and higher cost services as a result of not getting medications | No impact on SGF for MH unless clients needed more and higher cost services as a result of not getting medications | No impact on MHP local funds unless clients needed more and higher cost services as a result of not getting medications |
| 13. Eliminate coverage for atypical psychotropic medications | 1. Clients could require more intensive and expensive services without newer medications | No impact on FFP for MHPs for medication costs, but could result in higher service costs | No impact | No impact on local costs for MHPs for medication costs, but could result in higher service costs |
| 14. Eliminate UMDAP requirement for Medi-Cal beneficiaries | 1. Less paperwork | | | Lower administrative costs |
| 15. Flexible financing like the cash and | Would allow consumers to choose their services | Would cap FFP per user | Would require additional state | Would cap local county match per |

| carry or voucher concept | and would allow them greater flexibility in managing their care 2. Would cap services an individual could receive during a given time period 3. Could result in less services being available since programs could not plan on a certain amount of revenue to develop service capability | | staffing resources to implement | user |
|--|--|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| 16. Review and streamline administrative requirements | 1. Less administrative work | | Would require additional state staffing resources to implement | Reduce administrative costs |
| 17. Obtain exemption from new managed care regulations | Less administrative work Some outreach and client protections could be lost | Reduce FFP revenues for these activities | Reduce DMH costs, reduce SGF expenditures depending on which provisions are waived | Reduce local administrative costs |